

S P E E C H

OF

revised
all
HON. O. B. FICKLIN, OF ILLINOIS,

1808 - 1886

ON

THE OREGON QUESTION.

DELIVERED

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1846.

WASHINGTON:
BLAIR & RIVES, PRINTERS.
1846.

THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

THE OREGON QUESTION.

The Resolution from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, requiring the President to notify Great Britain of the intention of the United States to terminate the joint occupancy of Oregon, and to abrogate the convention of 1827, being under consideration in Committee of the Whole—

Mr. FICKLIN addressed the committee as follows:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The immense concourse of persons who have pressed to the Capitol each day, and the profound and unusual attention bestowed by members on this floor, sufficiently indicate the importance of the subject under discussion.

The masses everywhere are aroused, and the intense interest felt here is but an epitome of public sentiment in the States.

The Texas resolutions, which were introduced into this House at the last session with more than doubts of their success, gained strength at every step of their onward progress; and on the night of their final passage through the other end of the Capitol, a dread and deathlike silence pervaded the eager throng, who watched with throbbing hearts the first gleams of the new star ascending to its place in our political firmament.

A zeal no less burning—an excitement no less overwhelming—is destined to impel our citizens forward, until the Oregon question is satisfactorily and finally adjusted; and those politicians who recklessly attempt to breast the current of popular opinion, will as certainly be swept away by its wave.

Our geographical position, and the indomitable energy of our people, alike proclaim that this must become an ocean-bound republic; and the decree has gone forth, that we shall acquire territory on this continent whenever we may rightfully do so, and that we should not part with one foot of that which legitimately belongs to us.

“Texas and Oregon” were cradled together in the Baltimore convention, were inscribed on our banners, and were flung to the breeze in every portion of the Union. The annexation of the former was a bloodless achievement, and the occupation of the latter will be equally so, if we be firm and united. We should suffer no sectional jealousy, no touch of selfish or mercenary feeling, to warp our judgment on a question of this character. Nor should we stop to inquire whether the proposed acquisition of territory, east or west, north or south, gives the balance of power to this or that section of the Union; but, looking with an eye single to the aggrandizement of the nation as a whole, we should extend our limits whenever we can do so without invading the rights of others. On casting about, I am gratified to learn that most of the southern States, unbiassed by sectional jealousies, are with us on this question; and that a large majority of their members on this floor, animated by the true American feeling, are found in the front ranks doing battle for Oregon. The parallel between Texas and Oregon is striking in this, that those of our friends who took the responsibility to vote against Texas fell under the reproaches, not to say denunciations of their brethren, and endured all the horrors of the

faggot and stake. They now, in turn, indulge the "retort courteous" towards those who differ with us as to Oregon. While the majority of us must deeply regret that any occasion for vituperation should have arisen either on the one hand or the other, all must be admonished that, on a question of reannexation or occupation of territory, it is, to say the least, perilous to be tender-footed on any part of the ground.

Those who so earnestly (and I may add ably) oppose the giving the notice to Great Britain, differ with us only as to the means of obtaining the end. They, with very few exceptions, are decidedly of opinion that our title to the Oregon territory, up to 54° 40', is clear and indisputable, and are willing to go with us for all of those that I regard as the strong and warlike measures, which look to the taking and holding possession of that country.

My purpose, then, is not to upbraid them for this difference of opinion, but, as far as I can, to discuss the question with them; to oppose argument to argument, and let mind grapple with mind, until the judgment is convinced, so far as that can be done.

This resolution is debated by the opponents of the notice as a war measure; and it is sought to be made the occasion of producing a panic throughout the country; and brokers and stock-jobbers, together with that portion of the American press under their control, are uniting their efforts in this general outcry against a war. It is doubtless remembered by all, that these panic-makers have been engaged from time to time in alarming the public mind for the purpose of subserving their pecuniary interests. That Great Britain may make it the pretext of a war, as she might make the reannexation of Texas, or any other exercise of our rights, the pretext for war if she chose to do so, is not denied; but that it furnishes no just ground for an appeal to arms is, I think, plainly demonstrable.

The distinguished member from South Carolina [Mr. RHETT] seemed to congratulate himself upon the fact that he was pursuing a course on this question in opposition to the venerable gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. ADAMS;] and that, therefore, he must be right. Let him not, however, "lay the flattering unction to his soul;" for, unless the signs of the times greatly deceive us, Massachusetts and South Carolina, that have indulged the most deadly hate and bitter feuds towards each other in times past, will be found side by side at the present moment; and their sons, with a few exceptions, who have been for so long a time "looking daggers" at each other, will come up and vote together against the giving of this notice.

It is contended by some gentlemen that negotiations should be again renewed; but I think very differently. The ministers of Great Britain understand the arts of diplomacy better than ours. For more than a quarter of a century we have failed to settle this question by negotiation. Our offer of compromise has been formally withdrawn, and I think that the matter should rest there; and that we should now stand upon all of our rights until that imperious nation shall make us a fair and just offer.

Some, again, are proposing to arbitrate. This is

wholly inadmissible, for in that adjudication we should not be tried by our peers. Crowned heads do not desire to broaden or lengthen the territory of republican governments; but, on the contrary, they are strongly interested in enlarging the dominions and establishing the doctrine of "the divine right of kings." As well might the question of the divinity of the Messiah be submitted to the decision of Mahomedans and Jews, as for this question to be referred to the arbitrament of monarchs or of emperors. We know the decision in advance. No, sir; as much as I love peace, and desire to avoid war, yet if there is no other alternative but to arbitrate this difficulty, I would say, unhesitatingly, let it be done at the cannon's mouth.

Those of our friends who seem most alarmed at the prospect of a war, and who have depicted its horrors so eloquently and so vividly, were not, I believe, when Texas was the prize, afraid to meet Mexico, Great Britain, and France, combined, on the battle-field, and our navy and army were in no better state of preparation then than they are now. The Mexican Minister declared that annexation would produce war. He demanded his passports, and returned home. The fingers of Great Britain and France were traced in the plot to prevent annexation. It was then said we should have war with the three Powers combined; and all the effort then to get up a war panic did not check the "immoderate valor" of our friends, whose thoughts seem now so "turned on peace." It appears to me that they have placed themselves in a dilemma from which they cannot very well escape. South Carolina and Virginia, then so impetuous and eager for "bearding the British lion," are now the most eloquent in depicting the horrors of war and the prowess of British arms. These members admit that our title is clear, and yet they are unwilling to give the notice. This is a strange voice to come from these ancient Commonwealths; and did we not know better, it would be supposed to emanate from the peace party of New England.

The distinguished member from the Harper's Ferry district in Virginia [Mr. BEDINGER] described, with captivating eloquence, a scene he witnessed at that point. It was the American eagle, darting along the verge of a dark and portentous cloud, charged with thunder and gleaming with lightning, and perching himself upon one of the loftiest peaks of the Blue Ridge. The cloud passed away, the sun again shone forth from a clear sky, and he saw the eagle take his flight westward. I trust, sir, that his eagle has found a mountain as tall, a climate as genial, and a sky as clear in Oregon as those he left behind him. Virginia patriotism and valor have been illustrated in many a fearful conflict; and should war come upon us, I say, without hesitation, that all the eagles that have been driven from her mountains, either by thunder-clouds or panic speeches, will be won back by the deeds of noble daring of her sons upon the battle-field.

So, sir, with South Carolina, I know it is tauntingly said that her political leaders control the masses with absolute, not to say, despotic rule. It is believed by many that when her politicians take snuff, the common people involuntarily sneeze all over the State; and that you can ascertain the state of public opinion in South Carolina with as much

precision by inquiring of her distinguished statesmen as you can the rate of exchange at a given point by inquiring at the counter of a bank. How this may be I have not been there to inquire. But sure I am, that the undying fires of patriotism are yet smouldering in the land of Marion, of Pinckney, and of Sumter, and that they need but a proper occasion to give them vent. Should war come, (which I cannot for a moment believe,) those who now differ with us as to the policy of this measure, will, I doubt not, be amongst the first to kindle the watch-fires upon the altar of liberty. Let us therefore, on this occasion, not be intolerant towards each other; but while reposing a generous confidence, cultivate the kindlier and better feelings of our nature.

Our title to this territory is the pivot upon which the whole question must turn. It constitutes the very essence, soul, and life of the controversy. Some persons will deem it supererogation, at this stage of the discussion, to pause for a moment to prove our title, for the reason that both of the great political parties of this country concede it to be good and valid. That would do, if this country alone were concerned in the result. But I apprehend, that if the whig and tory parties in England should concede that we had no just claim to Oregon, we would not by any means regard that as conclusive proof of the fact.

If it can be established that we have a good and valid title to all or any portion of Oregon, it settles the question as to our duty, and as to our course, to the extent of the territory to which we are thus entitled. For if any of it is ours, we must hold it, or else yield it from fear of Great Britain. We cannot do the latter; for the act—craven and dishonorable in itself—would dissolve the charm and break the spring of our success as a nation.

Much has been well and justly said of the rapacity, injustice, and grasping ambition of Great Britain. Though she may be regarded by other nations as the “beast with seven heads and ten horns,” and though her iniquities toward them and us may, and indeed have, accumulated with each succeeding year; yet it all avails nothing in this controversy, if the territory belongs to her, and not to us. Therefore, I proceed to examine the different elements of our title.

By the Florida treaty of the 22d of February, 1819, we obtained all the rights which Spain then had to that country, north of 42° , whether accruing from discovery, exploration, or occupation; and they are as follows: From the time of the discovery by Columbus, in 1492, the Spanish Government never rested till they had explored the whole Pacific coast. In 1520, Fernando Magellan, in the service of Spain, discovered and sailed through the highly important and far-famed Straits of Magellan, which received and yet bear his name. In 1528, the celebrated Cortes, who was appointed by Charles V. as captain-general of New Spain, (now Mexico,) fitted out a vessel under the command of Maldonado, one of his officers, who was absent for six months, cruising in the Pacific. In 1532, he despatched two vessels, one under the command of Mendoza, and the other commanded by Mazuela, who sailed as far as the 27th degree of north latitude; and the country thus visited was

claimed by Cortes for Spain, and afterwards received the name of California.

The northernmost point occupied in 1530 on the Pacific by any civilized nation, was “Culiacan, which was founded by Nuno de Guzman, a Spaniard, at the entrance of the Gulf of California.”

The last expedition made by order of Cortes was commanded by Francisco de Ulloa, who took his departure on the 8th of July, 1539, from Acapulco. He discovered an island near the coast under the 28th parallel of latitude, which was named the Isle of Cedars. In 1543 Bartolome Ferelo, a Spaniard, under the authority of the Viceroy of Mexico, on the 26th of February of that year, discovered the Cape of Perils or Stormy cape, under the 41st parallel, which is supposed to be the place now called Mendocino; and on the 1st of March he had reached as far north as the 44th parallel of latitude—certainly as far as the 43° .

The Straits of Fuca, which enter the land at $48^{\circ} 24'$, and return to the ocean at 51° , were discovered in 1592 by Juan de Fuca, under Spanish authority, whose name they now bear; he sailed in and remained there more than twenty days, trading with the natives. In 1603 Cape Blanco, in latitude 43° , and the river Umpqua, in latitude 44° , were discovered by Ensign Martin de Aquilar, who was acting under the Spanish authority.

An expedition was fitted out in 1774, by order of the Spanish Government, under the command of Ensign Juan Perez, accompanied by Estavan Martinez as his pilot, with directions to sail as far north as 60° , and to survey the coast from thence southward to Monterey; and for them to take possession in the name of the King of Spain.

On the 18th of July, 1774, Perez reached as far north as the 54th parallel of latitude, and discovered land to the east, to which he gave the name of cape Santa Margarita.

He made land on the 9th of August in the same year, under the parallel of $49^{\circ} 30'$, anchored in a deep bay, and traded freely with the Indians, and called the place Port San Lorenzo; and it is undoubtedly the same which four years afterwards received from Captain Cook the appellation of King George's sound, but now known as Nootka sound—the name given it by the natives.

On the 15th of August, 1775, Heceta discovered the bay at the mouth of Columbia river, in latitude $46^{\circ} 17'$, but was prevented by the force of the current from entering the mouth of the river.

Bodega and Maurell proceeded in August, 1775, as far north as the 58th parallel of latitude, and took possession of the country in the name of the Spanish King. St. Salvador Diego, in the fall of 1790, explored the Russian possessions. These, together with many other voyages and explorations, here omitted for want of space, prove most clearly that, so far as discovery is concerned, Spain is greatly in advance of all other nations; and that her navigators had visited the whole coast of the Pacific as far north as the 61st parallel of latitude, long prior to those of any other nation.

The first navigator from whose discoveries Great Britain could derive any title on the northwest coast of America is Captain Cook, who, in March, 1778, visited Cape Flattery, in the 48th parallel of latitude; but he did not discover the mouth of the

Columbia or the Straits of Fuca. In March, 1778, he anchored in Nootka sound, and gave it the name of King George's sound; but Nootka was the name given to it by the natives, and it has ever since borne that name. He discovered many utensils of iron and brass, and also two silver spoons, of Spanish manufacture, in the possession of the natives—showing clearly that they had before been visited by the Spaniards.

Captain Cook, continuing his voyage north, saw Mount San Jacinto, which had been named four years before by Bodega; saw Mount St. Elias, and, pushing his voyage north, passed into the Arctic ocean. He afterwards visited Owyhee, where, on the 16th of February, he fell a victim to the natives.

It is claimed by the British minister, Mr. Pakenham, that Captain Berkeley, a British subject, in a vessel under Austrian colors, discovered the Straits of Fuca in 1787, when it will be remembered that Juan de Fuca made the same discovery in 1592—being 195 years previous; and that Captain Duncan, in the year 1787, entered the straits and traded with the natives at the village of Classet; and also that John Meares visited Nootka sound in 1788, four years after it had been visited and taken possession of by Perez. John Meares was a lieutenant in the British navy on half pay. The *Felice*, of which he was supercargo, and the *Iphigenia*, of which William Douglass was supercargo, were fitted out at the Portuguese port of Macao. Both were Portuguese vessels, and ostensibly commanded by Portuguese captains, sailed under the Portuguese flag, and had passports and other papers showing that the vessels were the property of Juan Cavallo, a Portuguese merchant of Macao.

If there had been any virtue in the discovery of Berkeley, it would have belonged to Austria, in whose service he was; or if there had been any merit in the discoveries of Meares, they would have enured to the benefit of Portugal. If Meares had attempted to navigate the North Pacific ocean as a British officer, his vessel would have been subject to seizure, and his officers and crew to punishment, as they had no license from the South Sea or East India companies. Whether he be regarded, therefore, as a British subject, sailing under false colors, or as in the employment of Cavallo, the Portuguese merchant, he could not claim any protection from the British Government, or confer upon her any rights resulting from his discoveries.

During all this period of time, it will be seen by reference to history that Great Britain had made no settlement whatever on the northwest coast of America; that she discovered no portion of the coast which had not been previously discovered by Spain; and that Spain held the undisputed title to it up to 1790, when John Meares called on the British Government to aid him. Had Great Britain possessed the same title that Spain did, can there be a doubt that she would have claimed and held the whole Pacific coast from Panama to Behring's straits?

It will be remembered, that when Great Britain planted her colonies on the Atlantic, she claimed, on the ground of continuity and contiguity of ter-

ritory, that her right of soil extended from the Atlantic to the Pacific ocean. The French Government discovered and explored the Mississippi and other tributary streams, and made settlements along their valleys. A dispute arose between England and France in regard to their territorial rights, and they went to war.

The treaty of Paris, concluded on the 10th of February, 1763, settled the boundary between those two nations; and so much of the 7th section as relates thereto is in these words:

“In order to re-establish peace on solid and durable foundations, and to remove forever all subjects of dispute with regard to the limits of the British and French territories on the continent of America, it is agreed that for the future the confines between the dominions of his Britannic Majesty and those of his most Christian Majesty, in that part of the world, shall be fixed irrevocably by a line drawn along the middle of the river Mississippi, from its source to the river Iberville, and thence, by a line drawn along the middle of this river, and the lakes Maurepas and Pontchartrain, to the sea.”

By this treaty Great Britain obtained the Canadas, Florida, and a portion of Louisiana; she parted with all her claims west of the Mississippi, received the full benefit of the doctrine of continuity, and is therefore estopped now from denying the principle.

By the treaty of Louisiana, dated on the 30th of April, 1803, we succeeded to all the rights which France acquired under the treaty of 1763, and have the full benefit of the doctrine of continuity, as England once had to any country lying west of the Mississippi, to which she had claims.

Now I will examine very briefly the title which we have to that territory in our own proper right, growing out of discoveries and settlements by this Government and its citizens.

In June, 1789, Captain Robert Gray, of Boston, explored the eastern coast of Queen Charlotte's island. In the summer of 1791, he visited the coast of the north Pacific, between 54° and 60° of north latitude. In May, 1792, he discovered Bulfinch's harbor; and on the 11th of that month he entered the mouth of the Columbia river, which Heceta could not do when he made the attempt in 1775; and both Meares and Vancouver, after examination, denied the existence of such a river. The tributaries of this river drain the territory of Oregon as far north as the 53d parallel of latitude. In 1804-5, an expedition was made under our Government by Lewis and Clarke, who visited and minutely explored that country. In 1811, settlements were made by the American Company at Astoria, near the mouth of the Columbia river, at Okenegan, six hundred miles above, and at Spokane, some fifty miles further up. They were captured by Great Britain during the war of 1812, and were restored under the treaty of Ghent, the 6th day of October, 1818. It cannot be successfully contended that the surrender did not restore to us all the country of which we were divested by the capture, for the latter was commensurate with the former act. We, therefore, are entitled to the Columbia river and the country drained by it, because we were the first to discover, explore, and settle it.

Uniting as we do the title of Spain, who, by dis-

covery and exploration, was between two and three centuries in advance of any other nation on the northwest coast of America, the title of France, together with the title acquired in our own right by discovery, exploration, and settlement, which is certainly good as against the claim of Great Britain, we have a complete and perfect title to the soil and sovereignty of the country between 42° and 54° 40' north latitude.

The talented member from the Boston district [Mr. WINTHROP] facetiously alluded to Adam's will and the Mormon testament in connexion with the Oregon question. As the British ministers have hitherto been unable to locate this vagrant claim of title—some of them relying solely on the Nootka Sound treaty, and others mainly on discovery—I must request my friend, at his earliest leisure, to consult, with his usual industry and research, the pages of the Mormon testament and of Adam's will, and if the British title to Oregon is not recorded in one of those time-honored instruments, it may be fairly presumed that it does not exist anywhere.

I will next proceed to examine the Nootka treaty, signed at the Escorial, October 28, 1790, between Great Britain and Spain. In order to a full understanding of the spirit and meaning of that convention, and to the position assumed by Great Britain at the time, it is important that we examine the circumstances which gave rise to it. The celebrated John Meares, who, as stated heretofore, was merely supercargo of a Portuguese vessel, sailing under the Portuguese flag, was the prime mover, the Alpha and Omega of the cause of difficulty between Spain and Great Britain, of which this treaty was the offspring.

Lieutenant Meares, with the two Portuguese vessels, visited Nootka sound, where they were captured in 1789, by Martinez, on behalf of the Spanish Government.

Spain having discovered and established a fort at Nootka sound, regarded Meares as an aggressor, and treated him as such. Meares, it will be observed, was a mere adventurer, trading with the natives, not connected in any way with the Government of Portugal, under whose flag he sailed, or with Great Britain, under whose flag he did not sail. Portugal took no notice of the complaints of Meares; not so with Great Britain, for she, probably at that time desiring a controversy with Spain, made it the occasion of a most rancorous quarrel with that Government. Meares presented a memorial, setting forth his grievances, containing many inconsistencies and palpable falsehoods.

I will here quote a few passages, to show the fertile imagination of the notorious John Meares, who possessed the power to amplify facts in a most eminent degree. At page 114 of his voyage, on the 25th May, 1788, he says:

"Maquilla had not only most readily consented to grant us a spot of ground in his territory, whereon a house might be built for the accommodation of the people we intended to leave there, but had promised us also his assistance in forwarding our works, and his protection of the party who were destined to remain at Nootka during our absence. In return for this kindness, the chief was presented with a pair of pistols,

which he had regarded with an eye of solicitude ever since our arrival."—*Voyage*.

On the third page of his memorial to the British Parliament, Meares says:

"Mr. Colnet was directed to fix his residence at Nootka sound, and with that view, to erect a substantial house on the spot which your memorialist had purchased in the preceding year; as will appear by a copy of his instructions hereto annexed."

We next turn to the instructions given by Meares to Colnet, dated Macao, 17th April, 1789, and find, upon their perusal, that no such instructions were given as stated by Meares in his memorial to Parliament. Passing on to the first article of the Nootka treaty, we find that on the 28th October, 1790, the spot of ground granted by the Indian chief to Meares had already "swollen into buildings and tracts of land." The account of Meares, of the rapid transition of the spot of ground granted him by the Indian chief into buildings and grounds, is only paralleled by the miraculous story of his illustrious predecessor, Sir John Falstaff, when giving a narrative of the attack made on him by the men in buckram. And justice can alone be done to the inimitable Falstaff, by giving the story in his own words:

"Poins. 'Pray God, you have not murdered some of them.

Fal. Nay, that's past praying for; for I have peppered two of them; two, I am sure, I have paid; two rogues in buckram suits. I tell thee what, Hal: if I tell thee a lie, spit in my face, call me horse. Thou knowest my old ward: here I lay, and thus I bore my point. Four rogues in buckram let drive at me—

P. Hen. What, four? thou saidst but two, even now.

Fal. Four, Hal; I told thee four.

Poins. Ay, ay, he said four.

Fal. These four came all a-front, and mainly thrust at me. I made me no more ado, but took all their seven points in my target thus.

P. Hen. Seven? Why, there were but four, even now.

Fal. In buckram.

Poins. Ay, four in buckram suits.

Fal. Seven, by these hills, or I am a villain else.

P. Hen. Prithee, let him alone; we shall have more anon.

Fal. Dost thou hear me, Hal?

P. Hen. Ay, and mark thee too, Jack.

Fal. Do so, for it is worth the listening to. These nine in buckram, that I told thee of—

P. Hen. So, two more already.

Fal. Their points being broken—

Poins. Down fell their hose.

Fal. Began to give me ground. But I followed me close; came in foot and hand; and, with a thought, seven of the eleven I paid.

P. Hen. O monstrous! Eleven buckram men grown out of two!"

Thus it will be seen that the story of Meares is a type, but too faithfully drawn, of the fabrications of Sir John Falstaff, and justly entitles him to the full name of Sir John Falstaff Meares. And, strange to tell, it was the marvellous story of this man Meares that caused the British ministry to levy an army, and threaten annihilation to Spain; and thereupon the King of England, in his message to Parliament touching the seizure of these vessels at Nootka, says: "That two vessels belonging to his subjects, and navigated under the British flag, and two others of which the description is not sufficiently ascertained, had been captured at Nootka sound by an officer commanding two Spanish ships of war; the cargo of the two Brit-

'ish vessels had been seized, and their crews had been sent as prisoners to a Spanish port."

"Pitt, then in the pride of his power, had inherited his father's hatred for, and contempt of, the 'Spanish nation,' and he seized the opportunity to make Spain yield to his dictation or overthrow her empire; hence he demanded the surrender of her clear and undoubted rights, and assembled a mighty armament to awe her into submission; but the movements of the French Government in ordering forty-five sail of the line, and a proportionate number of frigates, the treaty of peace concluded between Sweden and Russia August 3, 1790, so as to leave the latter in a powerful condition to prosecute her designs upon Turkey, together with the financial condition of Great Britain, induced Mr. Pitt to change his views, and to seek, through the intervention of the National Assembly of France, conducted in a secret and confidential manner, a treaty of peace and alliance with Spain; and the Nootka convention was the result of that negotiation. This, it must be borne in mind, was the second year of the French Revolution, and during the spread of republican principles. These facts may furnish some clue to the reason why the Nootka treaty is one for the benefit of traders, hunters, and trappers merely, and does not in any way whatever affect or weaken the title of Spain to the soil. The hut of the fisherman and the cabin of the hunter and trapper alone were looked to and provided for. Great Britain softened down in her demands and exactions, lest, perchance, Russia, Sweden, and France might make common cause with Spain against her, and for fear that the revolutionary spirit of France might seize the subjects of Great Britain. But for this Spain would have had to truckle to the blustering of Great Britain, and to have given her part, or perhaps all, of that territory.

In this position I am fortified by the celebrated French historian, Segur, whose work bears date in 1801. In speaking of this transaction, he says that England, "under the flimsy pretence of reclaiming 'some contraband ships taken by the Spaniards on 'the west coast of North America, threatened and 'declared war against Spain." (2d vol., page 163, Segur's History.) Further on, at page 171, same volume, he says that "France, after a short hesitation, notwithstanding the disorder of her finances, determined to support Spain against the English." * * * * *

"And the cabinet of London, intimidated by this 'energetic and unexpected resolution, postponed its 'ambitious projects; contented itself with the restitution of the English vessels that had been captured, and agreed with the court of Madrid mutually to disarm."

The 5th article of the Nootka treaty, which is the only important one bearing on this point, is in the words following:

"ART. 5. As well in the places which are to be 'restored to the British subjects by virtue of the 'first article, as in all other parts of the northwestern coasts of North America or of the islands adjacent, situate to the north of the parts of the said 'coast already occupied by Spain, wherever the 'subjects of either of the two powers shall have 'made settlements since the month of April, 1789,

'or shall hereafter make any, the subjects of the 'other shall have free access, and shall carry on 'their trade without any disturbance or molestation."

I will now give a few instances of the construction put upon this treaty by British statesmen, selecting as well those who supported the ministry, as those who opposed it. The Duke of Montrose, who moved an address of thanks to the king for having made the treaty, used this language:

"We are not only restored to Nootka, but, by 'an express stipulation, we may participate in a 'more northern settlement, if we should find at any 'time that a more northern situation would be 'preferable for the carrying on of the trade."

Mr. Dundas said:

"At Nootka we have obtained a specific right to 'trade and fish."

Of the opposition, Mr. Fox said:

"Our right before was to settle in any part of 'South or Northwest America, not fortified against 'us by previous occupancy; and we are now restricted to settle in certain places only, and under 'certain restrictions; we had obtained an admission 'of our rights to settle to the north, and even that, 'we had not obtained with clearness, as the Spanish settlements were the only mark of limits."

Lord North said: "Was it not necessary to 'know the reasons for so vague a delineation of 'our rights in the northwestern American seas as 'the convention contained, and of the boon of 'Spain's not colonizing beyond the most northern 'of her settlements?"—(See vol. 28, pages 980, 996, Parliamentary History.) It is thus shown that Great Britain could make no settlements south of Nootka sound. That this Nootka treaty was one for the purposes of commerce, navigation, and trading with the Indian tribes, and that it does not confer the right of soil and sovereignty, is further shown by Messrs. Huskisson and Addington in their communication to Mr. Gallatin in 1826, while negotiating about the territory of Oregon. They say: "Great Britain claims no exclusive sovereignty over any portion of the territory on the Pacific between the 42d and 49th parallels of latitude; her present claim—not in respect to any 'part, but to the whole—is limited to a right of 'joint occupancy in common with other States, 'leaving the right of exclusive dominion in abeyance; and her pretensions tend to the mere maintenance of her own rights in resistance to the exclusive character of the pretensions of the United States." "The rights of Great Britain are recorded and defined in the convention of 1790, '(with Spain;) they embrace the right to navigate 'the waters of those countries, to settle in and over 'any part of them, and to trade with the inhabitants and occupants of the same. It is admitted 'that the United States possess the same right; but 'beyond those rights they possess none."

This convention, therefore, between Great Britain and Spain does not in any way impair the ultimate sovereignty which Spain had exercised for more than two centuries over the whole Pacific coast as far as the 61st degree of north latitude. The planting of permanent colonies by Great Britain is nowhere granted in that treaty, nor is exclusive jurisdiction given to her over any portion

of the soil. The right of fishing, hunting, trapping, and trading with the natives, and erecting such temporary buildings as might be necessary for that species of commerce, is all that was granted by that treaty, is all that its language imports, or that British statesmen claimed for it. But this treaty, whatever it may have been originally, was wholly abrogated in 1796 by the war between Great Britain and Spain. Such is the settled law of nations, as recognised over and over again by Great Britain. In 1815, Lord Bathurst, in negotiating with Mr. Adams, says: "That Great Britain knows of no exception to the rule that all treaties are put an end to by subsequent war between the same parties."

Prior to the late war, the United States enjoyed the right upon the banks of Newfoundland of landing and drying their fish. Pending the negotiations of Ghent for concluding a treaty of peace between Great Britain and the United States, the British plenipotentiaries reaffirmed the foregoing principle as to the dissolving of treaties. In volume 9, page 321, of the American State Papers, it will be seen that our ministers, in a communication to the then Secretary of State, say that the British ministers stated to them "that before they desired any answer from us, they felt it incumbent upon them to declare that the British Government did not deny the right of the Americans to the fisheries generally, or in the open seas; but that the privileges formerly granted by treaty to the United States, of fishing within the limits of the British jurisdiction, and of landing and drying fish on the shores of the British territories, would not be renewed without an equivalent." Hence it will be seen that, by their own rule, the war between Great Britain and Spain, in 1796, totally annulled this treaty.

The next treaty having reference to this subject which I will notice, is the one between Great Britain and the United States, bearing date 20th October, 1818. The third section, which is the only one necessary here to be quoted, is as follows:

"It is agreed that any country that may be claimed by either party on the northwest coast of America westward of the Stony mountains shall, together with its harbors, bays, and creeks, and the navigation of all rivers within the same, be free and open for the term of ten years from the date of the signature of the present convention, to the vessels, citizens, and subject of the two powers; it being well understood that this agreement is not to be construed to the prejudice of any claim which either of the two high contracting parties may have to any part of the said country, nor shall it be taken to affect the claims of any other power or state to any part of the said country; the only object of the high contracting parties in that respect being to prevent disputes and differences among themselves."

The treaty between the same parties of August 6, 1827, which is a mere prolongation of that of 1818, provides by its first section for the indefinite continuance of the privileges of free navigation, hunting and fishing; and the second section thereof is in the following words:

"ART. 2. It shall be competent, however, to either of the contracting parties, in case either

should think fit, at any time after the 20th of October, 1828, on giving due notice of twelve months to the other contracting party, to annul and abrogate this convention; and it shall in such case be accordingly entirely annulled and abrogated after the expiration of the said term of notice."

It will be seen by examining the provisions of all these treaties, that the right of eminent domain is nowhere granted or disposed of; and that the mere temporary rights of the trapper, the hunter, and the fisherman, are alone contemplated by them. It will be further observed that the two Governments, looking to the future settlement of the country, when it would become important that the territorial limits should be defined, provided by the treaty of 1827 a peaceable mode for its annulment and dissolution. Giving the twelve months' notice is the conventional mode pointed out by the two Governments in the treaty of 1827 to untie the gordian knot, without resorting to the sword to sever it.

It is contended by some gentlemen on this floor, and by a portion of the press, that Great Britain has for years past been regardful of the rights of other Governments.

It is not my purpose to deal in high-sounding epithets of denunciation against Great Britain, for they can do no good to the cause; but I desire here to bring forward a few occurrences in illustration of her imperious disposition towards other Powers.

Take, for instance, the Nootka affair. Here were Portuguese vessels with a Portuguese owner, sailing under the Portuguese flag, and landing in the Spanish dominions. They are captured by the Spanish authorities. The British Government, in the pride, and I may say insolence of her power, assumed the act and held Spain responsible; and why? Because Spain was too weak, single-handed, to resist her arbitrary exactions.

Take the case of her whipping the Chinese until she compelled them to buy her opium, and then made them pay the expenses of the war!

Take the case of the *Caroline*, an American vessel, anchored to the American shore, at Schlosser, and boarded by British subjects at midnight, set on fire, and sent headlong over the falls of Niagara!

Our Government demanded satisfaction for the invasion of our territory, and outrage on the rights of our citizens; but the British Government assumed the act, and no indemnity was given to the owners of the *Caroline*, and no atonement made for the murder of Durfee. Sir Allan McNab was knighted, and a dinner was given to him, and a pension to Captain Drew, for the part they bore in this disgraceful transaction.

If there is one sin in the conduct of this Government deeper than all others, it is their permitting this indignity and insult on the part of Great Britain to pass with impunity. How different is it from the example given to the world in the Nootka case.

Great Britain has a sliding scale not only in regard to her corn laws, but she has one also in regard to the faith which she keeps with other nations. She feels the pulse of a nation with whom she has or expects to have a controversy, in order to ascertain how large a dose of her compound of

arrogance and exaction the patient will stand, and she deals out the nostrum accordingly.

We are asked how Great Britain can avoid going to war with us if our citizens settle north of the Columbia river, or venture on any part of the territory which she claims? My reply is this: that when she, by bluster and bravado, places herself in a false position in regard to another nation, and finds that her demands will not be submitted to, and that she can expect no benefit from a war, she will have sufficient address to bow herself out of it with a tolerable grace. Such is her position now. She claims that which is ours; if we submit, she will take it, and Iowa and Wisconsin into the bargain. If we do not submit, she, seeing that war would be more perilous to her than to us, will re-examine her title-papers, and find and bring to light some map with red lines traced upon it, that will let her out of the difficulty, and cover her retreat.

The war-cry that has been raised here and throughout the country, in the discussion of this question, I regard as one of the greatest humbugs of the age. It is a tempest in a teapot, which, like the innumerable bank panics and war panics gotten up for the occasion within the last fifteen years, will have its day, and pass off, leaving those who are alarmed by it to wonder why they were so needlessly excited.

Let the war prophets avoid the error into which Miller fell in foretelling the destruction of the earth, and not set the day for the fulfilment of the prophecy too near at hand.

Great Britain does not desire a war with us, and we do not desire a war with her. She wants our bread rather than our blood. The mutual interests of the two nations are bonds between them to keep the peace. She must obtain from us our cotton and provisions in exchange for her manufactures. To talk about Great Britain conquering us is wholly preposterous. Our territory extending from ocean to ocean—our population, numbering twenty millions of souls, nerved by the conviction that ours is the best and the only popular government on earth, we are impregnable to the attacks of any and all foreign powers. The inevitable result of a war would be the loss to Great Britain of the Canadas. She has done much more by her course in regard to the Oregon territory to provoke us to a war than all of our proposed measures can do to embroil her in a war with us. In addition to the other acts of aggression upon our territory, we find the reasons avowed for renewing the charter to the Hudson Bay Company in the following extract:

"On the 10th of February, 1837, the Hudson Bay Company applied to the British Government for a new lease of their charter for twenty-one years. The application was made in a letter of that date, from J. Pelly, Esq., Governor of the Company, to Lord Glenelg, then Secretary of State for the Colonies. This letter sets forth the grounds of the application. It states all that the company have done to carry out the purposes of the British Government. It tells how they have driven the Americans out of the fur trade, and got it all for themselves—how they occupy the whole country by twenty-two permanent establishments, (this was in 1837,) and many distinct hunting

parties—how they keep six armed vessels, one of them a steamer, off the coast—how they have in one place begun farming, and mean to export agricultural products—how the country is as fine farming ground as any in America—and, finally, how they confidently hope that, 'with care and protection, the British dominion may not only be preserved in this country, which it has been so much the wish of Russia and America to occupy, to the exclusion of British subjects, but British interest and British influence may be maintained as paramount on this interesting part of the coast of the Pacific.' Thus far—and it is very far—Governor Pelly, speaking to the Government of the company's purpose and policy.

"But this is not all. On the 1st of February, 1837, George Simpson, Esq., agent of the company in America, writes to Governor Pelly on the same subject. He says, 'the possession of that country (Oregon) to Great Britain may become an object of very great importance, and we are strengthening their claim to it by forming the nucleus of a colony, through the establishment of farms and the settlement of some of our retiring officers and servants as agriculturists.' This too went to the Government with the application for a new lease. Of course the company got their lease. To the British Government such arguments were altogether irresistible. But, be it observed, into the new lease thus granted in 1838, the Government introduced a wholly new condition. Lord Glenelg tells them in his reply, that they may have their trade monopoly as before, 'but,' he adds, 'it will be indispensable to introduce into the new charter such conditions as may enable her Majesty to grant, for the purpose of settlement and colonization, any of the lands comprised in it.' And accordingly in the charter was inserted a proviso reserving to the crown, in the largest terms, a full right to 'establish colonies,' and 'govern' them, and 'annex them to other colonies belonging to the crown'—and this in any of the 'lands granted.' What were these lands so granted? The northwest of America not 'under any civil government of the United States.' That is, every inch of Oregon, down to latitude 42 degrees."

Thus it will be seen that the Hudson Bay Company, under the authority of the British Government, is not only settling her retired servants in that country, but is also preparing prospectively for establishing colonies there; and still we have made no war upon that power for her encroachments. Yet the distempered fancy of some gentlemen has not only enabled them to see the "air-drawn dagger," but also to fancy they see Great Britain shaking her "gory locks" at us for our supposed violation of her rights. The war-spirit is already sufficiently ardent throughout the country, and does not require to be fanned into a flame.

Some of those on the other side, in marshalling the strength of Great Britain, have referred to her seventy odd colonies, scattered over every portion of the globe, as giving her military power; but the reverse is the fact. Her colonies, exclusive of the Canadas, number, at a low estimate, one hundred and twenty millions of souls; of this number there is not one million of the white European race; consequently, in any emergency, that immense

mass of human beings, held in subjection against their will by a handful of British, must revolt and turn upon their oppressors. The overseer working and governing a hundred hands would not, in case of an insurrection amongst the negroes, be more perfectly powerless in quelling them than would Great Britain to subdue her colonies in the event of a general rebellion. Her colonies, therefore, cannot aid her in a war with us, but they may in the meantime achieve their freedom from British thralldom. Ireland, too, is rife with the war spirit against England, and she would apply the torch on the first fitting occasion.

The aggressions of Great Britain upon American rights—her bribing the mercenary Indians in times past to the murder of helpless women and children, have fixed a deep-rooted prejudice in the minds of our people, and they are at all times eager for a war with her when occasion shall require it; and if Great Britain shall make war upon us because of the assertion and maintenance of our rights, upon her head must rest the consequences.

Before the conflict is ended, her foundations may be sapped—her days may be numbered—and some modern Daniel may be called upon to read and to interpret the handwriting on the wall.

The territory of Oregon is bounded on the north by the parallel of $54^{\circ} 40'$, on the east by the Rocky mountains, south by the 42d parallel, and west by the Pacific. It is about 650 miles in length and 550 in breadth, and contains about 360,000 square miles; is greater in extent than the Atlantic portion of the thirteen colonies—stretching from the frozen regions of the north to those of perpetual verdure of the south; the climate is more soft and balmy, the soil is more lively and fertile. Its rivers rising in different portions of the territory, flow together, and passing through the gorges of the mountain, constitute the Columbia, and have a single outlet to the sea. Its coast, with a few exceptions, is what sailors term iron bound, and would require but few fortifications to make it impregnable to the attack of enemies. Thus situated, this territory in the hands of Americans is eminently fitted for strength, union, and wealth; it cannot be divided without mutilating its fair proportions; it must belong to one nation, and that should be the United States. It is ours, and no fear of sacrifice, either of blood or treasure, should induce us to yield one foot of the territory; it is too intimately connected with American power and greatness to suffer it to be sacrificed on any terms.

Although for a number of years past but few of our citizens, except trappers and hunters, have gone to Oregon, yet within the last three or four years the tide of emigration to that country has rapidly increased. Distance seems to be overlooked by them. Nothing can be more interesting than the narratives given of the travels, from day to day, of the thousands who are marching over barren plains and sandy deserts to Oregon. In 1843, among other emigrants, there passed through my section of country an elderly gentleman, with his wife, his children, and his grandchildren, numbering between thirty and forty. They had their flocks and their herds with them, and, camping for a few days in one of our prairies, they purchased some cattle to add to their stock. The old man had

a bright eye, a firm step, and a heart that quailed not in contemplating dangers and difficulties. He was going to get land for his children and grandchildren—to occupy the American soil; and I could not but think how greatly our people were in advance of the Government.

These accounts constantly remind us of the travels of the patriarchs of old; and looking back through the dim vista of time to the days of primitive simplicity, we see Abraham and Lot pitching their tents in the land of Canaan and the plains of Jordan, separating to the right hand and to the left, to prevent strife between their herdsmen, as the whole land was before them; when Jacob, with his household and his cattle that were ring-streaked and speckled, departed from Padan Aram, the home of Laban, his father-in-law, and returning to visit his father in the land of Canaan, met and exchanged fraternal salutations with his brother Esau, in "the land of Seir," the country of Edom; when Moses and Aaron, following the "pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night," conducted the children of Israel in their pilgrimage through the wilderness. Here, however, the parallel ceases, for the American flag has not been furnished to our people, and the American laws have not been extended over them, to guide them to, and shield them in, the "land of promise" beyond the mountains; yet they press onward with an ardor and an energy which fatigue cannot exhaust or subdue, encountering at every step the untutored savage, and enduring toils and privations known only to the hardy pioneer.

We can have but a faint conjecture of the tumult of delight and the wild and rapturous joy which heaves the bosom of those enterprising spirits, when from the crest of the Rocky mountains they first gaze upon the hills and valleys, mountains and rivers beyond—when they stand upon the bluffs, and with bewildering delight hear the roar of the mighty Pacific. These men have gone forth to found an empire, animated by the same noble and generous impulses which bore the pilgrim fathers across the deep to the rock of Plymouth, and which tempted Boone in his ventures across the Cumberland mountains, and through the fertile and beautiful vales of Kentucky to the banks of the majestic Ohio.

Who of them in those days could see even dimly in the future the new States which would spring up and spread over this continent from sea to sea? The wildest dreams of the enthusiast of those days have been more than realized, for the march of improvement has outstripped the imagination itself. There is in this untameable spirit of enterprise—which is one of the elements of the nature of the American people—no touch of sordid or mercenary feeling. They go forth to see, to explore, and to inhabit the green and glad earth which God has given them, and ocean and mountain barriers will not restrain, cannot limit, their onward march.

This wild spirit of adventure gives nerve and energy to the mental and physical man, and prompts its possessor to deeds of peril and of danger, from which the tame and timorous would shrink with horror; it expands the heart, and unfetters its joys, its hopes, its aspirations; it lends a new charm to

life, a new spring to human energies and desires, and wakens in the breast a kindred feeling with that which animated our first parents in the garden of Eden. I would say to all who desire to go to Oregon, that it holds out to the emigrant inducements of the most tempting and permanent character. Go and select your farm and your home, while you have the whole country to choose from; plant yourselves upon the virgin soil, and our population stretching in dense masses to the west, will soon embrace you within its circle. For myself, I look forward with a lively hope to the period when I shall climb the mountains, traverse the valleys, and cross the rivers of Oregon; and standing upon the banks of the Columbia, listen with wild delight to the roar of its waters as they rush into the Pacific.

About the parallel of 48°, there are some excellent harbors; but south of that there are none, except Bulfinch's harbor and the mouth of the Columbia—neither of them very desirable.

As the most authentic source whence information can be derived on this subject, I will give a few extracts from the narrative of Captain Wilkes touching the harbors and the mouth of the Columbia river. Speaking of the latter he says:

"Mere description can give little idea of the terrors of the bar of the Columbia; all who have seen it have spoken of the wildness of the scene, the incessant roar of the waters, representing it as one of the most fearful sights that can meet the eye of a sailor."—*Vol. 4, p. 293.*

On the subject of the parts south of Fuca's straits he says:

"The coast of Oregon, to the south of Cape Flattery, (the southern cape on the Straits of Fuca,) is rocky, much broken, and affords no harbors, except for very small vessels."—*Vol. 4, p. 296.*

Again, speaking of the coast south of the Columbia river, he says:

"No ports exist along any part of the coast of Oregon, south of the Columbia river, that are accessible to any class of vessels, even those of but very small draught of water."—*Vol. 5, p. 148.*

Further on he speaks in raptures of the safety and capacity of the harbor at Puget Sound. Any number of the largest line-of-battle-ships that this nation would need or could command, might ride there in the utmost safety. This is his description of it:

"Nothing can exceed the beauty of these waters nor their safety; not a shoal exists within the Straits of Juan de Fuca, Admiralty Inlet, Puget Sound, or Hood's canal, that can, in any way, interrupt the navigation of a seventy-four-gun ship. I venture nothing in saying, there is no country in the world that possesses waters equal to these."—*Vol. 4, p. 305.*

Hence it will be seen that the recent proposition on the part of Great Britain to divide the territory, was to give her the lion's share—to yield to her the maritime supremacy of the Pacific. The President was therefore right in promptly rejecting it, and no party or individual in this country can be sustained who would advise its acceptance.

The country abounds in mountains and valleys, rivers and plains, woodlands and prairies, and from its climate and soil it is destined to be one of the finest grazing countries on the continent.

Captain Spalding, in his letter, says:

"The colony from the United States is situated in the Willamette, (a branch of the Columbia,) about ninety miles from the mouth of the river, which is undoubtedly the finest grazing and wheat country in Oregon.

"The extent of the country comprising the Willamette valley, is about 300 miles long and 200 broad, interspersed with wood, generally of sufficient quantities for fuel and fencing. The land, in its natural state, is usually ready for the plough, and is very fertile, producing from 25 to 40 bushels of wheat to the acre; and the climate is so mild, that the cattle subsist in the fields without fodder or shelter of any kind being prepared or provided for them through the winter. Probably no place in the world affords greater inducements for emigrants."

"One farmer in 1837 raised 4,500 bushels of wheat, 4,000 bushels peas, 1,700 bushels barley, and 1,500 bushels oats.

"Figs, citrons, oranges, lemons, and most of the fruits common to the United States, grow there.

"Farmers can raise any number of cattle, horses and hogs—sometimes five or six hundred head of each kind of animals.

"Wheat is nominally worth \$1 per bushel; beef, 6 cents per pound; pork, 10 cents; cows, \$50 each; oxen, \$60; horses, \$35; potatoes bring about 25 cents per bushel; and labor is worth about \$35 per month—the laborer being found by his employer."

From this outline it will be perceived that Oregon is as favorably endowed by nature with all the elements of wealth and greatness as any section of the Union, and all that is required for the development of its resources is the hand of industry and labor.

Not less gifted is it by nature for commerce; and in this point of view it occupies the most commanding position. Its geographical advantages of situation enables it, under the control of an active and energetic American population, to penetrate every path and island of the Indian ocean, whether in pursuit of the whale, or in the rich products of the tropics—consisting of cotton, indigo, tea, coffee, sugar, spices, and all the luxuries which can minister to the wants of man. Being opposite and near to Asia, it can, by means of commerce, enter largely into the East Indian and China trade, and draw from the mines of eastern wealth and magnificence countless millions, and plant upon her seaboard, cities destined to rival in grandeur ancient Carthage, Tyre, and Venice.

"The American continent, washed in its entire length by the two great highways of nations, presents extraordinary advantages to its population for commercial intercourse. Its position is one of nature's monopolies." * * * *

"Seat the United States firmly in Oregon, and the commercial enterprise and wealth of the world will centralize within our limits. The trade of the Indian ocean has enriched every nation in succession

‘ that has enjoyed it. Tyre, Phenicia, Venice, the
 ‘ Italian States, Portugal, and Spain, found it a mine
 ‘ of wealth. Great Britain at the present moment
 ‘ owes much of her supremacy in commerce, manu-
 ‘ factures, and wealth, to the fact that she partici-
 ‘ pates more largely than any other Power in its
 ‘ possession. The tropical circle in no portion of
 ‘ its belt around the globe, presents such extensive,
 ‘ varied, and valuable productions as are found in
 ‘ Southern Asia, and in the islands of the Indian
 ‘ ocean. No nation is or has been so favorably
 ‘ situated to divert this stream of wealth into its lap,
 ‘ as will be the population occupying Oregon.’’

Such is the spirit of the present age that the im-
 provements and facilities of intercourse amongst na-
 tions and communities have outstripped the imagi-
 nations and expectations of the most sanguine; and
 it is not chimerical to say that, in a few years, rail-
 roads will cross the Rocky mountains and con-
 nect with St. Louis; thence by that and every mode
 of connexion with the large Atlantic and inland
 cities, diffusing for home and foreign consumption
 a trade whose vastness and extent would outvie any
 heretofore known in the experience of the world.

Thus having the Atlantic on the east and the
 Pacific on the west, our commerce would display
 its canvass on both oceans, and bear from every
 clime the rewards of its enterprise. Every sinew

and artery of the nation would be quickened and
 invigorated by the new impulse given to its strength
 and activity, whilst agriculture would reap the
 golden fruits of the harvest, and manufacturers learn
 to excel the best productions of other nations.

Having, I trust, in my feeble manner, illustrated
 the advantages resulting to this country by holding
 our territory on the Pacific, and having shown that
 the title is unquestionably in us, we have, it seems
 to me, but one course to pursue, and that is, in a
 peaceable, quiet, but at the same time determined
 manner, to maintain our rights, come what may.

Ours should be a peace policy. We should
 avoid war if we can do so without dishonor; but
 rather than suffer the national tone to be depressed,
 the stars and stripes to be dimmed, or the territory
 which is rightfully ours to be wrested from us, we
 should unhesitatingly make this last appeal of na-
 tions without counting cost or consequences.

While we would not invade the rights of the
 weakest, we should not, with impunity, submit to
 wrongs from the most powerful and haughty nation
 on the globe.

“ Be just and fear not;” and if in the dispensa-
 tion of events war should come upon us, I cannot
 doubt but that at its close, as at its commencement,
 the American eagle would hover over us with his
 eye unquenched and his spirit unterrified.

